



HCP.No.2285 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2285 of 2024

Nagammal

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Represented by its Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Kancheepuram District.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District.
Kancheepuram.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Bureau,
Kancheepuram District.

5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 063.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2285 of 2024

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in RC.No.163/2024/M6-D.O.NO.42/2024 dated 01.08.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Thiru.Rajasekar S/o.Muniyandi, aged about 30 years, the detainee now confined in Central in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Hon'ble Court and set the petitioner's son Thiru.Rajasekar S/o.Muniyandi aged about 30 years the detainee herein at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Muthukumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by *S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.*)

The order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent in proceedings RC.No.163/2024/M6-D.O.NO.42/2024 dated 01.08.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



HCP.No.2285 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is an inordinate delay in passing the order of detention.

4. In the instant case, the detenu was arrested on 15.06.2024 and thereafter, the detention order came to be passed on 01.08.2024. This fact is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

5. In the case of '**Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura**', reported in '**2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813**', when there was an inordinate delay from the date of proposal till passing of the detention order and likewise, between the date of detention order and the actual arrest, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that the live and proximate link, between the grounds and the purpose of detention, stands snapped in arresting the detenu. The relevant observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted hereunder:-

“20. It is manifestly clear from a conspectus of the above decisions of this Court, that the underlying principle is that if there is unreasonable delay between the date of the order of detention & actual arrest of the detenu and in the same manner



HCP.No.2285 of 2024

WEB COPY

from the date of the proposal and passing of the order of detention, such delay unless satisfactorily explained throws a considerable doubt on the genuineness of the requisite subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority in passing the detention order and consequently render the detention order bad and invalid because the “live and proximate link” between the grounds of detention and the purpose of detention is snapped in arresting the detenu. A question whether the delay is unreasonable and stands unexplained depends on the facts and circumstances of each case.”

6. Drawing inspiration from the judgment in ***Sushanta Kumar Banik's case***, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of '***Gomathi Vs. Principal Secretary to Government and Others***', reported in '***2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332***', had held that when there is an inordinate delay from the date of arrest/date of proposal till the order of detention, the live and proximate link between them would also stand snapped and thereby, had quashed the detention order on this ground.

7. In yet another case i.e., in '***Nagaraj Vs. State of Tamil Nadu***', reported in '***(2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428***', this Court had held that the delay



HCP.No.2285 of 2024

WEB COPY

of 36 days in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenu would snap the live and proximate link between the grounds and purpose of detention. Hence, in view of the unexplained and inordinate delay in passing the order of detention, after the arrest of the detenu, the detention order in the present case, is liable to be quashed.

8. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in RC.No.163/2024/M6-D.O.NO.42/2024 dated 01.08.2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Rajasekar S/o.Muniyandi, aged about 30 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.]

[V.S.G., J.]

21.10.2024

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ep



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2285 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

ep

To

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Kancheepuram District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District.
Kancheepuram.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Bureau,
Kancheepuram District.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 063.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

H.C.P.No.2285 of 2024

21.10.2024